

Work-In-Progress Ideas Listing

Cost Savings & Efficiency Work Group

1. **“Design-Build” Approach** – Allow the City to enter into a single contract with a partnership of a design professional (i.e., engineering or architectural firm) and construction contractor for a given project. City current contracts separately with firms to design and build a specific project. This approach would save time by giving the City the ability to negotiate a single agreement resulting in a project that is designed and constructed by a predefined “team” or partnership of firms. Present State purchasing laws governing local jurisdictions in Nebraska may not allow this approach to be used.
2. **Costs for Sidewalks and Street Trees Along Arterials** – Developers working adjacent to arterials post sureties to guarantee the installation of sidewalks and street trees. How were these expenses accounted for in the projected arterial street costs calculated by Public Works & Utilities?
3. **Costs for Retaining Walls** – Should the cost of retaining walls be included in the projected future cost of an arterial? This cost could be reduced with the use of the 120 ft. right-of-way and refinement of grading standards.
4. **Prioritize CIP relative to the Comprehensive Plan** – Give consideration to methods for prioritizing capital improvement program (CIP) projects in relation to the City’s Comprehensive Plan phasing. How are projects prioritized now? And how might that process be developed further?
5. **Width of Driving and Turning Lanes** – City has been using the standard of 12 ft. lane widths in calculating future arterial costs. Should this standard be reduced to a narrow lane width to save construction costs?
6. **Formalize “Pro rata Ordinance” Approach** – City should clarify and formalize its “oversize standards” and methods for collecting fees from future developments. The City needs to make explicit the circumstances under which it will enter into a agreement for oversizing utility lines, who will pay for the oversizing, and how future developments benefitting from the lines might contribute to the cost of their construction.
7. **City Policy Governing Lift Stations/Force Main vs. Gravity Flow Sanitary Sewer** – The City’s current policy is to utilize gravity flow sewers as their primary collection method for sanitary sewers. Lift stations and force mains are discouraged and rarely used.

8. **Utility Policies Regarding Materials and Line Size** – The City has policies regulating the size of and materials used for water and sewer lines. There should be further discussion concerning these policies. For example, should major lines be sized for ultimate development conditions or with future parallel lines accommodated in the design? Should there be different policies for transmission vs. distribution lines?
9. **Materials for Street Construction** – Is the City's present policy concerning the use of concrete vs. asphalt in constructing streets and roadways the most cost efficient? Asphalt streets typically last 15 years; in contrast, concrete streets can last 50 or more years.
10. **City Inspection Policy** – The diligent inspection of projects as they are being constructed represents an "insurance policy" against costly repairs and rectification in the future. The City's current crew of inspectors is "under-staffed" and should be expanded.
11. **Platting Procedures** – Are there time efficiencies that could be gained from the present City platting process? This may include issues concerning the review process and fees.
12. **Costs Associated with Relating and Burying LES Lines** – Who pays the cost of relating and burying LES lines when an arterial is built (or rebuilt?) Is LES contributing to the cost of upgrading or increasing capacity when this situation occurs? It appears that street improvement projects may be funding LES expansions and upgrades.
13. **Reimbursement of Costs for LES Lines** – PW&U has indicated that some "LES costs" are initially paid for out of project budgets; which are then reimbursed by LES; which in turn are reimbursed by City general fund revenues. This policy should be examined further to determine its implications for potential cost savings and for calculating "future project costs" for arterials.
14. **Policy Concerning Developer Contributions to Arterial Projects** – A new City policy may require developers along an arterial to contribute one-half of the cost associated with a "2 through-lanes-and-a-center-turn-lane" facility. Is PW&U giving credit to the developer's contribution in their cost projections?
15. **Phasing of Development in Comprehensive Plan** – The phasing of public services into the new urban areas could occur over a longer period of time. This phasing approach would be a source of significant cost savings.
16. **Use "Indefinite Delivery Contracts" for Public Works & Utility Projects** – "Indefinite delivery contracts" can be used to contract for projects and services as determined by the City at some time in the future. Such contracts contain the general terms (i.e., what sort of work is to be done) and cost/fee schedules (i.e., how much the City would pay for a given unit of work) for future projects or professional services.

The contracts would not be “project or service specific” but rather would simply put a private firm in a contractual relationship with the City. It would then be up to the City to determine the specific project to be undertaken by the firm at some point in the future. Contract size (i.e., overall dollar amount such as under \$50,000, \$50,000 to \$250,000, and over \$250,000) could be used to stratify firms and the work they are contracted to complete.

17. **City Street Standards** – The City has certain standards used in designing future arterials. These standards should be reviewed for possible cost savings.
18. **Right-Of-Way Acquisition Policy** – Savings in roadway cost can be accomplished through the advance acquisition of sufficient public right-of-way. This discussion should include how the City can obtain adequate ROW for future projects through the platting process or other forms of advanced acquisition. Right-of-way should be acquired in advance of development to minimize ROW costs.
19. **Policies Concerning Potential Projects Not in the CIP and Not in Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan** – There should be a discussion regarding how to handle projects that may not be shown in the City’s CIP and that may fall outside of the growth areas shown in the Comprehensive Plan. It may be desirable from an economic development perspective to accommodate such major investments that may not have been planned for or otherwise anticipated.
20. **District Approach** – Examine the more extensive use of the “district approach” currently used in constructing certain city infrastructure improvements. This approach allows the private contractor to install improvements without going through the City’s purchasing procurement process.